



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
13/710,629	12/11/2012	ANDREW KEITH LEVANDOSKI	END920120161US1	1011

87334 7590 05/02/2017
IBM END IPLAW (GLF)
c/o Garg Law Firm, PLLC
4521 Copper Mountain Lane
Richardson, TX 75082

EXAMINER

TRAN, LOC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/02/2017

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@garglaw.com
dpandya@garglaw.com
garglaw@gmail.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Ex parte ANDREW KEITH LEVANDOSKI,
JOHN FRANKLIN MURRAY,
RAMANAKUMAR NATARAJAN,
TIMOTHY WAYNE OWINGS, and
RAVINDRAN YELCHUR

Appeal 2016-005248
Application 13/710,629¹
Technology Center 2100

Before JEAN R. HOMERE, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, and
JOHN A. EVANS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

STEPHENS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a Final Rejection of claims 1–20 (App. Br. 4). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We AFFIRM.

¹ According to Appellants the Real Party in Interest is International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York. App. Br. 2.

CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

According to Appellants, the claims are directed to a method and computer program product for source record management for master data (Abstract). Claim 1, reproduced below, is representative of the claimed subject matter:

1. A method for source record management, the method comprising:

a computer receiving a set of data records from a set of data sources for updating records of an entity in a master data repository;

the computer pre-processing a first subset of data records from the set of data records, the first subset of data records being received from a first data source in the set of data sources, wherein the pre-processing recognizes duplicate records that are present within the first subset of data records received from the first data source, and wherein the first data source is other than an existing repository of data records accessible to the computer;

the computer requesting a match engine to match a first data record from the first subset of data records using at least one record in the master data repository, the requesting resulting in a set of matched data records, the set of matched records including the first data record;

the computer further requesting the match engine to match, in the master data repository, a second data record from a second subset of data records, the second subset of data records being received from a second data source in the set of data sources, the further requesting resulting in adding the second data record to the set of matched data records;

the computer post-processing the set of matched data records; and

the computer assigning the first data record to a group of records, the group of records and the first data record together representing the entity as a master data record in the master data repository.

REFERENCES

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Cushman II et al. (hereinafter Cushman)	US 7,526,486 B2	Apr. 28, 2009
Conrad et al. (hereinafter Conrad)	US 2009/0198678 A1	Aug. 6, 2009
Cohen	US 2012/0072464 A1	Mar. 22, 2012
Liensberger et al. (hereinafter Liensberger)	US 2013/0091138 A1	Apr. 11, 2013

REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 10–12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman and Liensberger (Final Act. 2–6).

Claims 2–7 and 13–18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman, Liensberger, and Conrad (Final Act. 6–12).

Claims 8, 9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman, Liensberger, and Cohen (Final Act. 12–14).

ISSUE 1

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1, 10–12, and 20

Appellants contend their invention as recited in claims 1, 10–12, and 20, is not unpatentable over Cushman and Liensberger (App. Br. 10–14; Reply Br. 2–3). The issue presented by the arguments is:

Issue 1: Has the Examiner shown the combination of Cushman and Liensberger teaches or suggests “wherein the pre-processing recognizes duplicate records that are present within the first subset of data records received from the first data source, and wherein the first data source is other than an existing repository of data records accessible to the computer,” as recited in claim 1?

ANALYSIS

Appellants argue Liensberger teaches solely removal of duplicate records (App. Br. 12; Reply Br. 2). According to Appellants, Liensberger does not teach the duplicate records present within the first subset of data records received from the first data source, as recited in claim 1 (App. Br. 12 (citing Liensberger ¶ 99); Reply Br. 2). Appellants assert Liensberger does not teach the manner in which the duplicates occur (App. Br. 13). Appellants further contend Liensberger in combination with Cushman teaches “removal of duplicates from existing data in an existing repository,” (App. Br. 13).

We are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments. The Examiner finds and we agree, Liensberger teaches data are submitted by a module 206 for semantic categorization 402 which uses a variety of data enhancement services 204 (Ans. 3 (citing Liensberger ¶ 4, 106, Figs. 2, 4)). As explained

by the Examiner, the data enhancement service includes removal of duplicate records (Ans. 3 (citing Liensberger ¶ 99)).

Thus, we agree with the Examiner's findings that Liensberger's removal of duplicate records by the data enhancement service, in data submitted to the data enhancement service, teaches "wherein the pre-processing recognizes duplicate records that are present within the first subset of data records received from the first data source, and wherein the first data source is other than an existing repository of data records accessible to the computer," as recited in claim 1.

In light of these findings and conclusions, Appellants have not persuaded us the combination of Cushman and Liensberger fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the limitations as recited in independent claim 1. Commensurately recited independent claims 12 and 20 and claims 10 and 11 are not separately argued, instead relying on the arguments set forth for claim 1 (App. Br. 14; Reply Br. 4); thus, these claims fall with claim 1.

ISSUE 2

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 2–7 and 13–18

Appellants contend their invention as recited in claim 2 is not unpatentable over Cushman, Liensberger, and Conrad (App. Br. 14–19; Reply Br. 3–4). The issue presented by the arguments is:

Issue 2: Does the combination of Cushman, Liensberger, and Conrad teach, suggest, or otherwise renders obvious "wherein the first record in the first subset and the second record in the master data record are both records of the entity," as recited in claim 2?

ANALYSIS

Appellants argue Conrad teaches the entity field suffixed with globally unique identifier, “guid,” indicates a unique entity (App. Br. 18 (citing Conrad ¶ 14)). According to Appellants, all records referencing entity_guid of Conrad refer to the same entity (App. Br. 18). Appellants further contend entity_seq field in Conrad operates as a foreign key, but does not identify a unique entity (App. Br. 18 (citing Conrad ¶ 13)).

Appellants’ arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner finds Conrad teaches the procedure for adding a new name of a person having multiple names to the master data record (Ans. 5 (citing Conrad ¶ 13, Fig. 2)). The Examiner further finds Conrad teaches a new record representing the new name for a person is added to the MRD_NAMES table and is assigned foreign key entity_seq<fk> (Ans. 5 (citing Conrad ¶ 13, Fig. 2)). The foreign key entity_seq<fk> in the MRD_NAMES table points to the primary key entity_seq<pk> assigned to the entity record of the person in the MRD_ENTITIES table (Ans. 5 (citing Conrad ¶ 13, Fig. 2)).

We agree with the Examiner’s findings. Specifically, Conrad teaches a master record database 110 with a master record having an entity element 120 and multiple personally identifiable information (PII) elements 130A which are subsets of PII element 130 (*see* Conrad ¶ 13, Fig. 1; *see also* ¶ 14, Fig. 2). Conrad further teaches an entity 120A in entity element 120 has specific identification information 130A of the PII elements 130 of an entity (*see* Conrad ¶ 13, Fig. 1). Thus, Conrad teaches a first record in the first subset (PII element 130A) and the second record in the master data record (120A), are both records of the entity (120). Therefore, Appellants have not persuaded us the combination of Cushman, Liensberger, and Conrad fails to

teach “wherein the first record in the first subset and the second record in the master data record are both records of the entity,” as recited in claim 2.

In light of these findings and conclusions, Appellants have not persuaded us the combination of Cushman and Liensberger fails to teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the limitations as recited in claim 2 and claims 3–7 and 13–18, not separately argued (App. Br. 19; Reply Br. 4).

35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 8, 9, and 19

Appellants did not separately argue claims 8, 9, and 19, instead relying on arguments set forth with respect to claim 1 and contending Cohen fails to cure deficiencies of the combination of Cushman and Liensberger (App. Br. 19; Reply Br. 4). For the reasons set forth above, we are not persuaded by Appellants’ arguments. Therefore, we sustain the rejection of claims 8, 9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Cushman, Liensberger, and Cohen.

DECISION

The Examiner’s rejection of claims 1, 10–12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman and Liensberger is affirmed.

The Examiner’s rejection of claims 2–7 and 13–18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman, Liensberger, and Conrad is affirmed.

The Examiner’s rejection of claims 8, 9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cushman, Liensberger, and Cohen is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

Appeal 2016-005248
Application 13/710,629

AFFIRMED